



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,071	08/30/2006	Marc Van Loon	3732	6173
7590 Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743				
03/02/2011				
EXAMINER				
ZENATI, AMAL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/02/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,071

Applicant(s)

VAN LOON ET AL.

Examiner

AMAL ZENATI

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/08/2010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claims 1 - 2, and 5 - 11**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Maatta et al (US Patent No.: 5,768,370 B1; hereinafter Maatta)** in view of **Hargis David (Patent No.: WO 0205610; hereinafter David, IDS filed on August 30, 2006)**

Consider **claim 1**, **Maatta** clearly shows and discloses a discussion unit (10) for use in a conference system, wherein the discussion unit (10) is adapted to be connected to at least one second discussion unit (10) (fig. 1, label 20; col. 3, lines 25-35), wherein the discussion unit (10) comprises an essentially closed casing (410) (fig. 2, label 30) having a base (414) (fig. 8, label 102) and an additional narrow circumferentially closed edge (424) (fig. 8, label 100) and at least one exchangeable portion (420) (fig. 2, label 60) is configured as at least one closed rim (422) (fig. 4, label 60) that is removable mounted to the closed casing (410) so as to cover only the narrow circumferentially closed edge (424) of the closed casing (410) (abstract; fig. 1, fig. 2, fig. 4, fig. 8; col. 5, lines 42-50; and col. 7, lines 31-55); however, **Maatta** does not disclose the method, wherein the exchangeable portion consisting of a hollow only circumferentially closed rim (422).

In the same field of endeavor, **David** clearly discloses the method, wherein the exchangeable portion consisting of a hollow only circumferentially closed rim (422) (abstract; and page3, lines 1-19).

David discloses the above for the purpose of providing means to a display device of an electronics unit to be viewed by using a removable frame as to cover only a circumferential edge (page 3, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a removable frame that cover only a circumferential edge as taught by David in Maatta, in order to provide means to a display device of an electronics unit to be viewed by using a removable frame as to cover only a circumferential edge (page 3, lines 1-4).

Consider **claim 2, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), The discussion unit (10) according to the preceding claim, wherein the exchangeable portion (420) covers an outer ring-like portion of a surface of an outside part (424, 412) of the closed casing (410) (Maatta: fig. 8, labels: 60, 100, and 102; David: page3, lines 1-19; and fig).

Consider **claim 5, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the casing (410) comprises at least one operating panel (412), the operating panel (412) having at least one panel base (414) (Maatta: fig. 2, label 28), and at least one operating element (416) (Maatta: fig. 2, labels: 70 and 32), wherein the panel base (414) is at least partially surrounded by the rim (422) on its circumferential edge (Maatta: fig. 8, labels: 60, 100, and 102).

Consider **claim 6, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the at least one exchangeable portion (420) is mounted to the closed casing (410) by at least on interconnection (426) (Maatta: fig. 4, labels: 94; and fig. 8, labels: 92 and 104), the at least one interconnection (426) comprising at least one of the following: a form-fit interconnection; a force-fit interconnection (426).

preferably a snap- on mounting and/or a snap-hook (428) and/or a catch (438) (Maatta: fig. 4, labels: 94; and fig. 8, labels: 92 and 104; and fig. 7).

Consider **claim 7, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the closed casing (410) comprises at least one first section (452) (Maatta: fig. 1, label 60) and at least one second section (454) (Maatta: fig. 1, label 22), the at least one first section (452) and the at least one second section (454) being adapted to be attached to each other, wherein the at least one interconnection (426) is inaccessible from the outside of the casing (410) when the at least one first Section (452) and the at least one second section (454) are attached to each other (Maatta: fig. 8, labels: 60, 92 and 104, 28; and fig. 7).

Consider **claim 8, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the at least one first section (452) and the at least one second section (454) are adapted to be attached to each other by means of screwing (Maatta: fig. 3).

Consider **claim 9, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), an exchangeable portion (420) adapted to be used as the at least one exchangeable portion (420) in a discussion unit (10) (Maatta: fig. 2, labels: 60 and 28).

Consider **claim 10, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein a set of exchangeable portions (420), the set comprising at least two exchangeable portions (420) according to the preceding claim, wherein at least two of the exchangeable portions (420) differ with regard to color and/or material (Maatta: fig. 8, labels: 60, 92; and col. 4, lines 45-55).

Consider **claim 11, Maatta and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein a conference system comprising at least two discussion units (10) according to one of the preceding claims referring to a discussion unit (10) (Maatta: col. 3, lines 3, lines 25-45).

The present Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on August 26, 2010.

Applicant has amended **claim 1**; claims **1, 2, and 5-11** are now pending in the present application.

Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amal Zenati whose telephone number is 571- 270- 1947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571- 272- 7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571- 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Quoc D Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Amal Zenati/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

February 23, 2011